

Case No. 5:24-CV-00685-M-KS

Defendants.

ORDER

A magistrate judge’s recommendation carries no presumptive weight. *See United States ex rel. Wheeler v. Acadia Healthcare Co., Inc.*, 127 F.4th 472, 486 (4th Cir. 2025). The court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the . . . recommendation[] . . . receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). “The Federal Magistrates Act only requires district courts to ‘make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.’” *Osmon v. United States*, 66 F.4th 144, 146 (4th Cir. 2023) (quoting 28 U.S.C. §

636(b)(1)). And “a party’s objection to a magistrate judge’s report [must] be specific and particularized.” *United States v. Midgette*, 478 F.3d 616, 621 (4th Cir. 2007). This is a low bar, particularly when the plaintiff is pro se. *Elijah v. Dunbar*, 66 F.4th 454, 460 (4th Cir. 2023); *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). But absent a specific and timely objection, the court reviews only for “clear error” and need not give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

Upon careful review of the Recommendation and the record presented, and finding no clear error, the court ADOPTS the Recommendation of Judge Swank [DE 9] as its own. For the reasons stated therein, Plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis [DE 2] is DENIED, Plaintiff’s motion to seal the case [DE 1] is DENIED, and this action is DISMISSED for failure to prosecute.

SO ORDERED this 19th day of March, 2025.



RICHARD E. MYERS II
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE